



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,430

09/24/2003

Mikko Makela

915-007.048

5958

4955 7590 10/14/2008

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,430	Applicant(s) MAKELA, MIKKO	
	Examiner STEVEN B. THERIAULT	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 12-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 07/16/2008.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1, 5-10, 12-51 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 23, 26, 34, and 40 are the independent claims. Claims 2-4 and 11 have been cancelled and claims 50 and 51 are new. This final rejection is based on the amendment filed 04/28/2008 along with the supplemental amendment filed 07/16/2008 incorporating the new claim features and therefore this final action was necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17-20, 23, 25, 31-33, 40-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims appear to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. All of the claims refer to a device for the portrayal of navigation objects however the claim does not positively recite the hardware elements to classify the claims into one of the four classes of statutory subject matter. Clearly, these claims are not process claims, and not apparatus claims, or article of manufacture claims, nor composition of matter claims. Therefore, the claims do not recite the physical hardware elements to display the objects and to classify the claims as device claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2179

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. **Claims 1, 5-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 39-40, 46, 48 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Hocker et al. (hereinafter Hocker) U.S. Patent No. 5801699 filed Jan. 26, 1996.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects-, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, ~~wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects~~, wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two ~~graphical~~ navigation objects into a combined ~~graphical~~ navigation object, and presenting said at least two navigation objects if said combined navigation object is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62 and column 11, lines 25-67). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon (See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27) after the user has selected a web page or element. Within the page are Hyperlinks that are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how to display the objects in the page

Art Unit: 2179

on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45). Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the "my computer icon" and the "globe" icon and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3 ... so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach presenting said combined navigation object with an additional icon that indicates that said at least two navigational objects have been merged into said combined navigation object.

Hocker teaches a system that allows a user to combine two or more icons together to form an aggregate icon (See Figure 2 and column 3, lines 20-31). Hocker teaches a graphical indicator is displayed to show that two icons have merged (See column 3, lines 35-46 and column 4, lines 50-56). Icons are known in the art as a symbol or image that are located on an interface to either represent a function, an application, or process that can be executed on the machine when selected. Icons can simply be a symbol or image. Therefore, Hocker teaches a graphical indicator that is not static as it changes it can form a semi-circle. Hocker teaches the graphical indicator can be other figures but it is clear that graphical indication 297 is used to indicate to the user by presenting an additional graphical indicator on the display to indicate that the two icons have merged. Hocker specifically suggests that icons can be combined to provide an easy way to join two or more objects together (See column 6, lines 30-40). Hocker also suggests that grouped icons maintain individual operations but move and are represented as a grouped icon. Combined with the indication that the icons are grouped then Hocker clearly suggests to the user when

Art Unit: 2179

icons are connected through another visual indicator (See also column 2, lines 30-45). Kanevsky and Hocker both teach displaying icons. They both teach allowing the user to organize the icons on the screen to allow for user customization of the location of the icons on the display. They both also teach the process of transforming a single icon and converting it into a combination icon.

While Kanevsky shows the stripping of the icon and cutting it in half, Kanevsky teaches adding (module 904) onto the page. Hocker is an example of adding an icon to another icon.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Hocker in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an additional icon that indicates the icons have merged. The motivation to combine Hocker with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Hocker, to allow the user to organize icons on the screen as they desire (See column 1, lines 40-55) and that there are many applications the icon binding and clustering can benefit the user (See column 6, lines 4-10 and 15-25) specifically where application builders can create layouts of various components of a software application.

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said combined navigation object is presented in a first display mode, and wherein said at least two navigation objects are displayed in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object -is selected (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67). Kanevsky teaches the icons can be in one or more objects are shown in the icon. The Icon can be shown in the mode where the user's history deems where and when the icon is displayed (first mode). Another interpretation of Kanevsky teaches that the Icons can be combined and shown in a web page. The user can select one part of the Icon and then the second part is shown in a reduced state or as and ICON with the selected information displayed (Second mode).

With respect to **dependent claim 6**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein each of said at least two navigation objects is associated with one respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 7**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects is displayed or executed in said first display mode (See column 15, lines 35-61).

With respect to **dependent claim 8**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said navigation objects {are defined according to a markup language, in particular the Hypertext Markup Language (~~HTML~~) or derivatives thereof, and are interpreted by a browser (See column 6, lines 10-20).

With respect to **dependent claim 9**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said at least two navigation objects are hyperlinks (See column 10, lines 5-16).

With respect to **dependent claim 10**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said first display mode is a scaled format display mode, and wherein said second display mode is an un-scaled format display mode (See column 16, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67 and column 6, lines 52-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 12**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein in said first display mode, a first display window is used, and wherein in said second display mode, a second display window is used (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 13**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein both said first and second display mode are used in the same display window (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45 and figures 11, 12 and 14).

With respect to **dependent claim 14**, Kanevsky teaches the method herein in said second display mode, at least one of a horizontal and a vertical scroll bar (~~--7--~~) is provided (Kanevsky column 16, lines 25-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 15**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising ~~the step of~~ determining whether said at least two navigation objects have to be combined into one combined navigation object or not (See column 8, lines 43-67).

Art Unit: 2179

In regard to claims **17 -19**, claims 17 -19, reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 1, 5, and 15, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims **21-22**, claims 21-22 reflect the device comprising computer executable instruction used for performing the method steps as claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. Kanevsky expressly teaches the invention is utilized in a web environment which would include a browser (See figure 1, 101) and the computer readable medium to execute the steps of claim 1(See figure 2).

In regard to claims **23, 32**, claims 23, 32 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 26 and 28, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to **Independent claim 26**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, ~~wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects~~, wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, and wherein said combined navigation object is presentable and selectable to trigger presentation of said at least two navigation objects(Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon (See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27). Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how

Art Unit: 2179

to display the objects in the page on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45).

Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the "my computer icon" and the globe and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3, .. so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach presenting said combined navigation object with an additional icon that indicates that said at least two navigational objects have been merged into said combined navigation object.

Hocker teaches a system that allows a user to combine two or more icons together to form an aggregate icon (See Figure 2 and column 3, lines 20-31). Hocker teaches a graphical indicator is displayed to show that two icons have merged (See column 3, lines 35-46 and column 4, lines 50-56). Icons are known in the art as a symbol or image that are located on an interface to either represent a function, an application, or process that can be executed on the machine when selected. Icons can simply be a symbol or image. Therefore, Hocker teaches a graphical indicator that is not static as it changes it can form a semi-circle. Hocker teaches the graphical indicator can be other figures but it is clear that graphical indication 297 is used to indicate to the user by presenting an additional graphical indicator on the display to indicate that the two icons have merged. Kanevsky and Hocker both teach displaying icons. They both teach allowing the user to organize the icons on the screen to allow for user customization of the location of the icons on the display. They both also teach the process of transforming a single icon and converting it into a combination icon. While Kanevsky shows the stripping of the icon and cutting it in half, Kanevsky

Art Unit: 2179

teaches adding (module 904) onto the page. Hocker is an example of adding an icon to another icon.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Hocker in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an additional icon that indicates the icons have merged. The motivation to combine Hocker with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Hocker, to allow the user to organize icons on the screen as they desire (See column 1, lines 40-55) and that there are many applications the icon binding and clustering can benefit the user (See column 6, lines 4-10 and 15-25) specifically where application builders can create layouts of various components of a software application.

With respect to **dependent claim 28**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising determining whether said at least two navigation objects have to be combined into one combined navigation object or not, wherein said determining is performed by a device (See column 8, lines 35-67 and column 7, line 40-55).

With respect to **dependent claim 30**, Kanevsky teaches the computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 26 (See Figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to **Independent claim 34**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: receiving a combined navigation object obtained by combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, ~~wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects~~, and wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object by scaling,

presenting said combined navigation object, and presenting said at least two navigation objects, if said combined navigation object is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon (See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27). Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how to display the objects in the page on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45). Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the "my computer icon" and the globe and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3, .. so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach presenting said combined navigation object with an additional icon that indicates that said at least two navigational objects have been merged into said combined navigation object.

Hocker teaches a system that allows a user to combine two or more icons together to form an aggregate icon (See Figure 2 and column 3, lines 20-31). Hocker teaches a graphical indicator is displayed to show that two icons have merged (See column 3, lines 35-46 and column 4, lines 50-56). Icons are known in the art as a symbol or image that are located on an interface to either represent a function, an application, or process that can be executed on the machine when selected. Icons can simply be a symbol or image. Therefore, Hocker teaches a graphical indicator

Art Unit: 2179

that is not static as it changes it can form a semi-circle. Hocker teaches the graphical indicator can be other figures but it is clear that graphical indication 297 is used to indicate to the user by presenting an additional graphical indicator on the display to indicate that the two icons have merged. Kanevsky and Hocker both teach displaying icons. They both teach allowing the user to organize the icons on the screen to allow for user customization of the location of the icons on the display. They both also teach the process of transforming a single icon and converting it into a combination icon. While Kanevsky shows the stripping of the icon and cutting it in half, Kanevsky teaches adding (module 904) onto the page. Hocker is an example of adding an icon to another icon.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Hocker in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an additional icon that indicates the icons have merged. The motivation to combine Hocker with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Hocker, to allow the user to organize icons on the screen as they desire (See column 1, lines 40-55) and that there are many applications the icon binding and clustering can benefit the user (See column 6, lines 4-10 and 15-25) specifically where application builders can create layouts of various components of a software application.

With respect to **dependent claims 35, 46 and 48** as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Hocker teaches every limitation of claims 23 and 34.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach a method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects if said navigation object is selected comprises presenting said navigation objects in an un-scaled format. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Hocker, because Hocker (See column 6, lines 45-55 and Figure 3) shows the selected icon as it was before it was combined but with the aggregate of another icon with it and the icon has not been scaled.

Art Unit: 2179

With respect to **dependent claim 39**, Kanevsky teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 34 (See figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to claim **40**, claims 40 reflects the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claim 34, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims **50-51**, Kanevsky teaches and shows the objects are graphical and text (See Figure 13, text objects and Figure 14, graphical object).

Claims 24-25, 27, 31, 36-37, 41-43, 45,47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Hocker et al. (hereinafter Hocker) U.S. Patent No. 5801699 filed Jan. 26, 1996, in further view of Rozenholtz et al. (hereinafter Rozenholtz). U.S. Publication No. 20030030678 filed Aug. 8, 2001

With respect to **dependent claims 24-25, 27, 31, 36-37, 45, 47** as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Hocker teaches every limitation of claim 1.

Kanevsky in view of Hocker does not expressly teaches the method wherein at least two navigation objects are merged into said combined navigation object by scaling

Kanevsky teaches combining an object when it is determined that a browser page is too large to be displayed on a small screen(See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65). Kanevsky teaches that if the larger screen were to be used then items can be added to the page. Hocker does not mention scaling. Kanevsky does not expressly teach the reducing of the Icon is performed through scaling. Rozenholtz teaches scaling combined objects into a thumbnail, where pages can be scaled to fit into a thumbnail and sections of the thumbnail can be clicked on to retrieve the represented page (See Para 55-56). Rozenholtz teaches a display rule that determines how to display a document where the appearance of elements can

Art Unit: 2179

be changed. Therefore, in a first mode the rule can show the image in normal or un-scaled mode. In a second mode, based on the rule, the image may need to be smaller to get the users attention, or larger which can be done via scaling. Rozenholtz and Kanevsky both teach a process of reducing an image to display it on a smaller device. They both teach combining items into a smaller representation of the image and they both teach the reduction occurs by using priorities or rules.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky, Hocker and Rozenholtz in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky and Hocker to include a specific scaling process to combine the graphical objects when selected through a scaling process. The motivation to combine Rozenholtz with Kanevsky and Hocker comes from the suggestion in Rozenholtz, to scale elements on a page in accordance with known techniques (See Para 55) for the purpose of displaying selectable elements to a user in a reduced format so that they can determine the relevance of the action they are performing the interface by "clicking on an object" and what type of information will be retrieved in response to the click.

In regard to claims **41-43**, claims 41-43 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 35-37, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

6. **Claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Hocker et al. (hereinafter Hocker) U.S. Patent No. 5801699 filed Jan. 26, 1996, in further view of Carroll et al. (hereinafter Carroll) U.S. Patent No. 6154205 issued Nov. 28, 2000.**

With respect to **dependent claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44**, as indicated in the above discussion Kanevsky in view of Hocker teaches each limitation of claims 1, 17, 23, 26, 34 and 40.

Kanevsky teaches the process of combining two navigational objects and adapting the objects and displaying them in several states (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65). Rozenholtz expressly teaches scaling objects that are combined into a thumbnail through the process of scaling. The thumbnail can be large enough to display items at full size as the thumbnail represents entire pages of elements or multiple pages.

Kanevsky in view of Hocker does not expressly teach the method wherein said at least two navigation objects are image hyperlinks within an image map contained in a web page, wherein said combined navigation object is represented by a selectable scaled graphical representation of said image map and wherein said image hyperlinks within said image map are displayed in un-scaled format, if said selectable graphical representation is selected.

However, in the same problem solving area Carroll teaches a system of displaying at least two navigational objects that are image hyperlinks in an image map within a web page for the purposes of making it easier for a user to select and navigate through web based content and to select objects on the screen (See column 1, lines 30-50 and column 2, lines 35-42). Carroll also teaches a process where the document may be larger than the display area, which is analogous to the situation in Kanevsky. Finally, Carroll teaches the hyperlink can be virtually any type of object, which would include a combined object (See column 3, lines 55-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky, Hocker and Carroll in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an image map within the web page. The motivation to combine Kanevsky, Hocker with Carroll comes from the suggestion in Carroll that any type of object can be displayed as an icon (See column 3, lines 55-63 and column 6, lines 20-35) and that client side processing can include providing client side image maps contain selectable objects that are associated with hyperlinks, much like the associations made in Kanevsky.

Art Unit: 2179

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-10, and 12-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2179